DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 877 CS 212 647

AUTHOR Dickson, Tom
TITLE How Advisers View Changes in the High School Press in the Post-Hazelwood Era.
SPONS AGENCY Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.; Southwest Missouri State Univ., Springfield.
PUB DATE Dec 90
NOTE 94p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (Tampa, FL, December 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Freedom of Speech; *High Schools; *Journalism; Media Research; Public Schools; *School Newspapers; School Surveys; *Student Rights
IDENTIFIERS Advisor Role; *Hazelwood School District v Kuhlmeier

ABSTRACT

In Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier, The United States Supreme Court ruled that school administrators "need not tolerate" student speech deemed inconsistent with a school's educational mission. To study the effects of the ruling, a 36-question survey was mailed to a random sample of just under 1,600 American public high school English/Journalism departments. Questions addressed the following issues: demographic information; each school's newspaper and its purpose and content; school policy about content; changes in content since the Hazelwood decision; the type of prepublication review carried out; censorship; and student-adviser conflict. There was no majority position on the purpose of the newspaper, but nearly two-thirds of respondents identified the paper as an open forum for student speech that was not libelous or obscene or did not advocate violence. Little change in school administrators' treatment of the papers as a result of the Hazelwood decision was reported. Over half of respondents indicated that advisers objected to student stories most often because they were seen as unfair or unbalanced. The findings suggest that the Hazelwood decision was not the disaster many people in journalism education feared, and that student press freedom can co-exist with the Supreme Court ruling. (Fifty tables are included; a sample questionnaire is attached.) (SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327877

HOW ADVISERS VIEW CHANGES IN THE HIGH SCHOOL PRESS IN THE POST-HAZELWOOD ERA

A Study
for the
Secondary Education Division
of the
Association for Education in Journalism
and
Mass Communication

Dr. Tom Dickson
Southwest Missouri State University

CS212647

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas Dickson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FOREWORD

I would like to express my appreciation to Southwest Missouri State University for funding this research and to the Secondary Education Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication for co-sponsoring it. I also would like to thank the following people for reviewing the questionnaire used in the study: Secondary Education Division President Barbara Hines, Howard University; Dorothy Bowles, University of Tennessee; John Butler, Louisiana State University; Jack Dvorak, Indiana University; Ferrell Ervin, Southeast Missouri State University; Mark Goodman, director, Student Press Law Center; and Nancy Green, publisher, Springfield (Mo.) News-Leader. In addition, I would like to thank Bethany Oberst, dean, College of Arts and Letters, Southwest Missouri State University, for a grant to attend the Secondary Education Division Mid-Winter Meeting in New Orleans to propose the study; Mark Oglesby, coordinator of academic computing, SMSU, for computer programming; and Duane Bedell, coordinator of the SMSU English Department Computer Laboratories, for typesetting this report.

Springfield, MO
December 1990

How Advisers View Changes in the High School Press in the Post-Hazelwood Era

Freedom of the high school press has gotten considerable attention since the Supreme Court stated in *Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier* (1988) that the school "need not tolerate student speech that is inconsistent with the 'basic educational mission'" of the school. The court stated that school officials could censor articles that might "reasonably be perceived to advocate drug or alcohol use, irresponsible sex, or conduct otherwise inconsistent with the shared values of a civilized social order" or articles "with any position other than neutrality on matters of political controversy."

The court's decision appeared to be a significant limitation of the right to freedom of speech that the Supreme Court granted students in *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District* (1969), in which students were given considerable freedom of expression except when order in the school was threatened. Critics of the Hazelwood decision predicted that it would close what had been seen as a public forum (Abrams and Goodman, 1988; Phi Delta Kappa International [PDK], 1988; Brown, 1988; Eveslage, 1988; McNabb, 1988).

Though the Hazelwood decision gave school officials considerable authority over determining what speech is permissible in student publications, plays, and other school-sponsored events, studies have shown that officials at many schools had been practicing censorship for years. Two pre-Tinker studies indicated pervasive prior restraint. A study in Los Angeles County by Don Horine (1966) and one by Max James (1970) in Arizona found that principals and advisers felt they had the authority to censor and that many had censored or punished students for what was published.

Post-Tinker surveys tended to find the same thing. Laurence Campbell (1971) found in a nationwide study that more than a quarter of advisers said they should censor the newspaper, and most read editorial copy or page proofs. A majority of advisers responding to a survey of members of the Journalism Education Association (Nelson, 1974) said they had the final right of approval of articles, and one researcher in a study of Illinois public high schools (Nyka, 1979) concluded that principals and advisers either did not understand what rights students had or had decided to ignore those rights.

Robert Trager and Donna L. Dickerson (1980) concluded that size of school was a factor in type of control, with smaller schools putting greater restrictions upon student expression than larger ones. They also found that how likely school officials were to review controversial material differed from state to state and concluded that advisers with academic or professional backgrounds in journalism provided students more freedom than those without such a background.

In a national survey of student editors, Nicholas D. Kristof (1983) drew similar conclusions. He determined that about half of the public high schools he surveyed had overt censorship in the previous three years, that about 80 percent had restrictions of some kind, and that only 7 percent indicated no potential for censorship. He fashioned a censorship index and determined that school size had an inverse relationship to censorship. He also found a correlation, though a weak one, between his censorship index and the size of the community. He also found some differences based upon region of the country, with less censorship in the West and about the same amount in the Central, East, and Southwest regions. His model posited an indirect relationship between school size, town size, and class character of the community to the level of controversy and deference that students give the adviser in story selection and a direct relationship between the amount of controversy and deference that exists to the amount of censorship that exists.

In probably the first post-Hazelwood study published, Tom Dickson (1989b) found that Missouri principals did not expect to change the way they dealt with the school press because of the ruling. Dickson (1989c) also found that most Missouri school newspaper advisers shortly after the decision did not expect to look more closely at the content of the student newspaper. Dickson (1989a) found a year after the decision that nearly nine-tenths of Missouri advisers noted no increase in the amount of censorship over what took place before the Hazelwood decision. He also reported (1989d) that most principals said they had not looked more closely at student publications and were not more likely to review the newspaper before publication. Dickson (1989b) found that principals were less likely at large schools than at medium-sized or small ones to review publications and that school size appeared to be related to the type of controversial issues that high school newspapers covered.

Kay Phillips (1989) conducted a study of participants at a North Carolina Scholastic Press Association workshop at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in June 1987 followed by a direct mail survey of the same advisers following the Hazelwood decision. She concluded from her sample, admittedly not a random one, that advisers exert "subtle pressure" and that most of them censor their newspapers--either by eliminating controversial stories or having a policy or "atmosphere of intimidation" that results in student journalists employing self-censorship.

In the spring of 1989, J. William Click and Lillian Lodge Kopenhaver (1990) sent questionnaires to principals and newspaper advisers at schools that belonged to the Columbia Scholastic Press Association. They found considerable differences between responses from the two groups. For example, they found that 64 percent of principals and 27 percent of advisers agreed that the adviser has "a professional obligation" to see that an article that would put the school in a bad light is not published. They also concluded that obvious censorship was evident in replies of advisers and principals and suggested more research needs to be done in the area.

They also suggested that research should be done to determine "whether conditions are improving or deteriorating."

Post-Hazelwood findings by Dickson as well as Click and Kopenhaver suggest the need to look more closely at the hypothesis that censorship has increased because of the Hazelwood decision. Pioneering work done by Trager and Dickerson on school size and professional and academic background of advisers, by Kristof on the importance of type and size of community, region of the country, and amount of controversy, and by Dickson as to the types of articles that most likely lead to censorship provide a framework for such an analysis.

Method

A 36-question survey addressed to the English/Journalism Department was mailed to a random sample of just under 1,600 public high schools throughout the country (about 10 percent of the public high schools in the country) in the spring of 1990. Instructions directed the school newspaper adviser to complete the form if there was an adviser. If there was no newspaper adviser, a journalism teacher or the head of the English Department was asked to complete only Part I, the demographic questions, and return it. Someone at just under 32 percent of the schools (504) returned the questionnaire.

Respondents were asked 36 questions coded by the author to represent the eight major aspects of the study. The first 12 questions were designed to obtain demographic information, three questions concerned the newspaper itself, one concerned purpose of the newspaper, one concerned the school policy about content, three concerned changes in story content since the Hazelwood decision, three concerned the type of prepublication review carried out, seven concerned censorship, one concerned conflict, and five concerned newspaper content.

Because the purpose of the survey was to determine what responses would be given by newspaper advisers, only responses of newspaper advisers were analyzed. Analysis was by the chi square statistic, with the .05 level of confidence employed to determine statistical significance. Cramer's V, which can range from 0.0 to 1.0, was used to measure the strength of the association between variables.

Several research questions were proposed. The Supreme Court said the Hazelwood East High School Spectrum was neither a forum for the general public nor an open forum for students or student journalists because the school board had not opened the paper to "indiscriminate use" by student journalists or the student body. The first research question: What do advisers see as the most important purpose of the school newspaper? Because most schools give credit for being on the newspaper staff, it was proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Most advisers see the purpose of the student newspaper is to teach their students journalism skills.

The Supreme Court stated that instead of being a public forum, the intended use of the Spectrum was as a supervised learning experience for journalism students and that the school "need not tolerate student speech that is inconsistent with the basic educational mission" of the school. That suggested the second research question: Do most school policies state that student newspapers are open forums? Since it was expected that newspapers that are used as teaching tools would not be seen as public forums, it was hypothesized:

Hypothesis 2: The policy at most schools is that some subject matter, even though it would be constitutionally protected in an open forum, is to be kept out of the newspaper.

The Supreme Court said that standards of journalistic fairness in a public school should be higher than in the professional world and that the school "may refuse to disseminate student work that does not meet those standards." That led to the third research question: Is newspaper content more fair and balanced since the Hazelwood decision?

Hypothesis No. 3: Stories and editorials in high school newspapers have become more fair and balanced because of the Hazelwood decision.

It would be expected that advisers are more likely than before the Hazelwood ruling to have discussed potentially controversial stories with the principal because the adviser would be blamed if objectionable stories were printed. Thus, the fourth research question: Have advisers discussed potentially controversial material with the principal?

Hypothesis No. 4: Advisers have been more likely since the Hazelwood decision to discuss potentially controversial stories, editorials or photos with the principal before publication.

It would be expected that censorship has increased because of the Hazelwood decision; therefore, the fifth research question: Since the Hazelwood ruling, is the principal any more likely to review the contents of the newspaper?

Hypothesis No. 5: Since the Hazelwood ruling, principals have been more likely to review the contents of the school newspaper.

The Supreme Court said in the Hazelwood case that it had no problem with educators "exercising editorial control over the style and content of student speech in school-sponsored expressive activities so long as their actions are reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical concerns." The Court said the Spectrum adviser exercised a great deal of control over the newspaper and determined that the adviser was the "final authority with respect to almost every aspect of the production of the Spectrum, including its content. Moreover, the Court did not note any problem with that role. One means of control is through changing offensive content. Thus, the sixth research question: Are a majority of advisers censoring by changing the contents of the newspaper over the objections of editors?

Hypothesis No. 6: A majority of advisers will change the contents of the newspaper over the objections of the editor if they see the need to do so.

Another means of control is by censorship. Thus, the seventh research question: Are advisers censoring articles in the school newspaper and, if so, for what reasons? It was expected that advisers would be censoring controversial student work because of the Hazelwood decision.

Hypothesis No. 7: A majority of advisers are keeping controversial content from publication.

Because of the expectation that the Hazelwood decision would lead to more censorship, the eighth research question was proposed: Have advisers been censoring more articles since the Hazelwood decision?

Hypothesis No. 8: Advisers have been censoring more articles since the Hazelwood decision.

The Hazelwood East principal said he censored articles because the privacy of three girls interviewed about their pregnancies would have been invaded, that the privacy of their boyfriends and parents would have been invaded as well, and that they were not fair and balanced in that everyone involved had not been asked to present their side of the story. The Court also said that speech also could be rejected if it presented legal problems or if it was "ungrammatical, poorly written, inadequately researched, biased or prejudiced, vulgar or profane, or unsuitable for immature audiences." The court said the school also can refuse to sponsor student speech that advocates conduct inconsistent with "the shared values of a civilized social order" and speech that is other than neutral toward political controversies. Thus, the ninth research question: What kind of speech is most likely to cause conflict between advisers and student journalists?

Though it was assumed that the fairness and balance of stories was expected to be area of concern for advisers, it was not thought that fairness and balance would necessarily be a major cause of conflict with the adviser. It was thought, instead, that more conflict would arise over stories that involved issues of journalistic ethics. Thus, the ninth hypothesis:

Hypothesis No. 9: Privacy and embarrassment to student will be the area of the most conflict between advisers and student journalists.

Because the offending Spectrum articles did not promote any of the anti-social positions that the Court stated could be outlawed, it would be expected that students might be cautious about writing articles on controversial subjects, either because of adviser pressure or because they did not want to "rock the boat" and cause problems for the adviser. Thus, tenth research question: Are students writing about potentially controversial topics?

Hypothesis No. 10: Student journalists have been less likely since the Hazelwood ruling to write about potentially controversial subjects.

Because the importance of the adviser's academic background, school size, size of the community, and region of the country were found by Trager and Dickerson, Kristof, and Dickson to be related to freedom of the student press, a general research questions was proposed: Are community size, school enrollment, journalism curriculum, academic background of the adviser, whether the adviser is state certified to teach journalism, the amount of journalism teaching experience the adviser has, and region of the country where the school is located related to policies concerning the content of the student newspaper and to the content of the newspaper itself? Thus, the eleventh hypothesis consisted of several subhypotheses.

Hypothesis No. 11: Community size, school enrollment, existence of a journalism curriculum, the academic preparation of the adviser, whether the adviser is certified to teach journalism, years of experience in teaching journalism and advising, and region of the country where the school is located are related to differences in policies and content of the school newspaper.

The Findings

Demographics

Of the 503 people responding, 364 were newspaper advisers, 33 were journalism teachers but not newspaper advisers, and 106 were not advisers or journalism teachers. A total of 21.9 percent of those responding were at schools under 200 students in grade 10 through 12, 30.9 percent at schools with 200-500 students, 26.1 percent at schools with 500-1,000 students, 15.1 percent at schools with 1,000-1,500 students, and 6.0 percent at schools with more than 1,500 students. Just over one-fifth (20.4 percent) of respondents said their school had no student newspaper [as compared to 17.4 percent of student editors who gave that response in Kristof's 1983 survey]. Just over one-third of advisers (36.2 percent) stated that their school had no journalism courses.

Most respondents (58.0 percent) were in a rural area or community with less than 10,000 population, 25.5 percent were in a city or suburb with a population of 10,000-50,000, 8.5 percent in a city with a population of 50,000-150,000, 4.2 percent in a city of 150,000 to 500,000, and 3.8 percent in a city of more than 500,000.

The Newspaper

Nearly one-half of advisers (48.2 percent) said the newspaper was published about once a month, while 22.7 percent said it was published more than once a month and 19.0 percent said it was published less often than monthly but more than four times a year. About one-tenth (9.8 percent) said it was published four times a year or less. About one-fourth (23.5 percent) of advisers said no credit was given for

working on the newspaper staff, with 45.9 percent getting journalism credit and 30.6 percent getting English credit. A variety of procedures are used for determining who can work on the newspaper staff. The largest number of advisers (29.4 percent) said journalism courses were not offered and anyone in the appropriate grades could be on the staff. About the same number (23.9 percent) said that staff members must at least be enrolled in a beginning journalism course as said that it was not required that staff members have taken a journalism course even though such courses were offered (22.5 percent). Just over one-seventh (15.4 percent) of advisers said staff members must have finished at least one journalism class and currently be taking another journalism class, while 8.8 per cent said staff members must have taken at least one journalism class but did not have to be taking a course while on the staff.

Purpose of the Newspaper

The first null hypothesis, that most advisers do not see the purpose of the student newspaper is to teach students journalism skills, was not rejected. Only a minority (38.5 percent) of advisers gave "a means for journalism students to learn skills" as the most important purpose of the newspaper, though it was the most-given response. Nearly one-third (31.7 percent) gave "a means for student expression." About twice as many (14.9 percent) said the purpose was to report both good and bad as responded that it was to publicize school activities (7.6 percent) or to promote positive things about the school (7.3 percent).

Policies on Newspaper Content

The second null hypothesis, that the policy at most schools is that constitutionally protected speech was not censored, was not rejected. Nearly two-thirds of advisers (64.7 percent) said that the newspaper was an open forum for forms of student expression that are not libelous, obscene or advocate violence (and, thus, open to all constitutionally protected speech), and another 1.7 percent said it was an open forum for all forms of student expression. Less than one-fourth (23.6 percent) said the policy is that some subject matter is not to go into the paper, even if the story is not libelous, obscene or advocating violence, with the rest of the advisers (10.0 percent) saying there was no school policy about what is acceptable subject matter.

Fairness and Balance of Stories

The third null hypothesis, that stories and editorials have not become more fair and balanced because of the Hazelwood decision also was not rejected. A majority of advisers (51.2 percent) said they could not tell much difference in fairness and balance of stories, while 39.1 percent had no opinion. Only 6.1 percent said

they stories were somewhat or much more fair and balanced. A slightly larger majority of advisers (53.3 percent) said they could tell no difference in the fairness and balance of editorials with 35.6 percent having no opinion and only 8.6 percent saying editorials were somewhat more or much more fair and balanced.

Consultation with the Principal

The fourth null hypothesis, that advisers have not been more likely to discuss potentially controversial stories, editorials, or photos with the principal before publication, was not rejected. While nearly three-fourths of advisers (72.8 percent) reported that they discussed potentially controversial stories, editorials, or photos with the principal, more than four-fifths (81.0 percent) stated that they did not do so more often than before the Hazelwood decision. Only 15.0 percent of advisers said that the principal had told them to bring such matters to him or her, while 57.8 percent said they did it as a precaution.

Principal's Review of Contents

The fifth null hypothesis, that principals have not been more likely since the Hazelwood ruling to review the contents of the school newspaper, also was not rejected. Less than one-tenth of advisers (9.2 percent) said they had submitted the newspaper to the principal for review before the ruling, and only 6.9 percent of advisers stated that they had begun to submit the entire newspaper to the principal following the Hazelwood ruling. About two-thirds of those who had begun to do so since the ruling (4.4 percent of the sample) stated that they had done so because of school policy or the principal's policy with the rest saying they had done so because the principal was interested or "in case something in it is controversial."

Changing Wording

The sixth null hypothesis, that a majority of advisers did not change the contents of the newspaper over the objections of the editor, was not rejected. Nearly two-thirds of advisers (65.6 percent) said they had not changed story content, and only 2.4 percent stated that they had done so more than once.

Keeping Articles from Publication

The seventh null hypothesis, that a majority of advisers are not keeping controversial content out of the publication, was not rejected. For no issue area listed in the questionnaire had a majority of advisers kept a story from publication over the editor's objections. The most-likely reason for rejecting an articles was because it

was poorly written or researched or because it was not fair or balanced, with somewhat over one-third of advisers (37.2 percent) saying they had rejected at least one story for those reasons. The next-likely reason for rejection was because of concerns an article might embarrass a student or invade his/her privacy, with just under one-fourth of advisers (23.3 percent) giving that response. Less than one-fifth (19.2 percent) said they had rejected at least one article because its subject matter was too controversial, about one-sixth (16.6 percent) said they had rejected an article because it was an attack against a teacher, and about one-thirteenth (7.5 percent) stated that they had rejected an article because of possible legal problems.

The biggest reason for multiple rejections during the previous 12 months also was for a story being poorly written or researched or for not being fair or balanced, with 25.5 percent of advisers stating they had done so for those reasons more than once in that time period. Nearly 10 percent (9.8 percent) had done so more than once in the previous 12 months for stories invading privacy, 7.8 percent had done so more than once for stories that were too controversial, 3.1 had done so more than once because they attacked a teacher, and 2.8 percent had done so more than once because of legal concerns.

Change in Censorship Since Hazelwood

The eighth null hypothesis, that a majority of advisers have not kept more articles from publication since Hazelwood than they did before the ruling, also was not rejected. More than eight-tenths of advisers (82.1 percent) stated that there had been no change in the number of stories kept from publications in the previous 12-month period than in a typical 12-month period before the ruling, with 12.8 percent saying they did not know. Only 3.7 percent stated that the number of times stories had been rejected had increased since the Hazelwood ruling.

Cause of the Most Student-Adviser Conflict

The ninth null hypothesis, that privacy and embarrassment to a student would not be the cause of the most conflict between advisers and students, was not rejected. The greatest cause of conflict was stories that were not seen as fair or well-balanced, with 54.9 percent giving that response. Invasion of privacy came second, with 19.6 percent of advisers giving that response, with 10.7 citing questions of potential libel. The same number of advisers cited stories that attacked a teacher and stories with obscenities or dirty language (7.4 percent) as being the area of greatest conflict.

Covering Potentially Controversial Subjects

The tenth null hypothesis, that students would not be less likely to write about potentially controversial subjects, was not rejected. Nearly two-thirds of advisers (62.7 percent) stated that student journalists have been about as likely to write about such subjects, while 5.8 percent stated that students have been somewhat more likely to do so and 1.2 percent said they were much more likely to do so.

The largest number (72.9 percent) had run stories about alcohol abuse during the past 12 months with nearly as many (70.9 percent) running stories about drug abuse, while just over half (54.2 percent) had run stories about teen-age sexuality, 43.9 percent had run a story about AIDS, and 21.1 percent had run a story on divorce and broken homes.

Differences Based Upon Independent Variables

Differences Based Upon Community Size. The null sub-hypothesis, that there would not be a difference between advisers based upon community size, was not rejected. For only eight of 21 questions about content was there a statistically significant difference between advisers based upon community size. Because more than 20 percent of cells in tables based upon the original five categories for community size had expected frequencies of less than 5.0, the data were compressed into three cate- gories: under 10,000, 10,000-50,000, and more than 50,000.

A statistically significant difference was found based upon community size as to what advisers said was the purpose the newspaper (chi square = 17.03, df = 8, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .16). Advisers in communities under 10,000 were more likely than advisers in other communities to say that the purpose of the newspaper was to promote positive things about the school and to publicize school events and activities. Advisers in communities 10,000-50,000 were more likely to say that the newspaper was a means for student expression and less likely to say the purpose was to learn skills.

See Table 1.

A statistically significant difference also was found based upon size of community as to whether editorials were more fair (chi square = 10.05, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .12). Advisers at cities under 10,000 were more likely to have no opinion, while advisers in cities 10,000-50,000 were somewhat

more likely to say they were more fair and those in cities over 50,000 were more likely to say that editorials were not more fair.

See Table 2.

A statistically significant difference was found based upon size of city as to whether stories had been kept from publication over the editor's objections because of legal concerns (chi square = 7.11, df = 2, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .14). Advisers in the largest cities were less likely to have censored a story for that reason.

See Table 3.

A statistically significant difference was found as to whether the adviser had rejected stories over the objections of the editor for privacy concerns (chi square = 8.46, df = 2, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .15). Advisers at medium-sized communities were least likely to have rejected a story for privacy concerns, and those in communities under 10,000 were most likely.

See Table 4.

Another statistically significant difference was found for the type of story that has caused the most conflict between advisers and students (chi square = 29.40, df = 8, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21). Advisers in communities under 10,000 were more likely than advisers in other communities to say stories that were potentially libelous, that invaded privacy, or that attacked a teacher caused the most conflict. Those advisers in communities 10,000-50,000 were more likely to say that dirty language and obscenities caused the most conflict, and those in cities over 50,000 were more likely to say the cause was stories that were not fair and balanced.

See Table 5.

A statistically significant difference was found based upon size of the community for whether the newspaper had run a story on teen-age sexuality (chi square = 23.67, df = 2, significant at the .001 level of confidence, V = .26);

See Table 6.

on AIDS (chi square = 12.62, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .19);

See Table 7.

and on problems of divorce and one-parent homes (chi square = 15.46, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21), but not for stories on alcohol or drug abuse.

See Table 8.

For the issues of teen-age sexuality and divorce, the larger the community the more likely it was for the newspaper to have run a story. Advisers in cities with a population of less than 10,000 were less likely to have run a story on AIDS.

Differences Based Upon Enrollment. The null subhypothesis was not rejected. Responses to 10 of the 21 questions were statistically significant. Enrollment made a statistically significant difference for the question of whether stories have been more fair (chi square = 11.98, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .13). The smaller the school, the more likely it was for the adviser to say that stories were more fair and balanced.

See Table 9.

A statistically significant difference was found between advisers based upon school size as to whether the principal reviews the entire newspaper (chi square = 11.83, df = 4, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .13). The larger the school, the less likely it was for the adviser to send the newspaper to the principal to review and the less likely the adviser was to have begun to do so since the Hazelwood decision.

See Table 10.

A statistically significant difference between advisers was found as to whether they had kept a story from publication in the past 12 months over the editor's objections for privacy concerns (chi square = 11.24, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .18). Advisers at schools under 500 were more likely to have rejected a story for privacy concerns.

See Table 11.

Size of school also made a difference as to whether the adviser had kept a story from publication because it was an attack against a teacher (chi square = 12.24, df = 2, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .18). The larger the school, the less likely it was that the adviser had rejected a story for such an attack.

See Table 12.

Enrollment made a difference as to the type of story that had caused the largest amount of conflict between the adviser and the editor or a writer (chi square = 18.68, df = 8, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .17). The smaller the school, the more likely for the adviser to say stories containing potential libel, stories

that invaded privacy and stories that attacked a teacher were the reason for the greatest conflict. Also, the larger the school the more likely it was for the adviser to say the conflict was because the story was not fair or balanced.

See Table 13.

Enrollment made a statistically significant difference for the newspaper having run an editorial or news story on drug abuse (chi square = 9.59, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .16).

See Table 14.

Enrollment also made a difference about having run stories about teen sexuality (chi square = 35.53, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .32);

See Table 15.

---

on AIDS (chi square = 17.58, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .22);

See Table 16.

---

on alcohol abuse (chi square = 8.61, df = 2, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .16);

See Table 17.

---

and on the problems of divorce and one-parent homes (chi square = 12.67, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .19).

See Table 18.

In all cases, the larger the school the more likely it was for the newspaper to have run such a story.

Offering Journalism Classes. Whether journalism classes are offered was statistically significant for only seven of the questions, so the null subhypothesis was not rejected. A statistically significant difference was found for the question pertaining to the purpose of the newspaper (chi square = 26.41, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .27). Advisers at schools with journalism classes were more likely to say the purpose of the newspaper was to learn skills, while advisers at schools without journalism classes were most likely to give all of the other responses.

See Table 19.

Whether journalism classes was offered also was statistically significant for the question concerning the type of policy the school had concerning what subject matter should go into the student newspaper (chi square = 16.22, df = 3, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21). Advisers at schools with journalism courses were more likely to say the newspaper was an open forum for student expression that is not libelous, obscene or advocating violence, while advisers at schools with no policy were more likely to say they had no policy. They were about equally likely to say that some subject matter should not go into the newspaper even if not libelous, obscene or advocating violence.

See Table 20.

Advisors also differed based upon whether a journalism class is offered as to whether stories have been more fair and balanced since the Hazelwood ruling (chi square = 19.15, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .23) and

See Table 21.

whether editorials had been more fair and balanced (chi square = 17.79, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .22). Advisers at schools with no journalism classes were more likely not to have an opinion. When those with no opinion were

See Table 22.

eliminated, advisers at school where classes were offered were more likely to state that stories were more fair (11.4 percent versus 2.8 percent) though there was virtually no difference as to whether they thought editorials were more fair (13.4 percent versus 12.8 percent).

The survey also found a statistically significant difference between advisers at schools with and without journalism classes based upon the type of story that had caused the largest amount of conflict with an editor or writer (chi square = 17.25, df = 4, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .23). Advisers at schools with journalism classes were more likely to state that stories causing the greatest conflict were those with potential libel or that were not fair and balanced, while those at schools with no journalism classes were more likely to state that stories causing the most conflict were those that invaded privacy or had obscenities or dirty language.

See Table 23.

Newspapers in schools with journalism classes were more likely to have published stories in the past 12 months on drug abuse (chi square = 4.56 with Yates Correction and 5.17 without Yates Correction, both significant at .05 level of confidence, V [phi] = .12) and more likely to have published stories on teen-age

See Table 24.

sexuality (chi square = 5.25 with Yates Correction and 5.84 without Yates Correction, both significant at .05 level of confidence, V [phi] = .13).

See Table 25.

There was no significant difference in theie having run stories on AIDS, alcoholabuse, or divorce, however.

College Hours in Journalism. The null subhypothesis was not rejected. Responses to only six of the questions were statistically significant. The difference between responses of advisers to the question about what they saw as the most important purpose of the newspaper was statistically significant based upon the number of college hours they had had in journalism (chi square = 27.82, df = 8, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .20). The more hours of journalism, the more likely the adviser was to say that the most important purpose of the newspaper was to learn skills. Those with no college journalism hours were most likely to state that the most important purpose was to promote positive things about the school or to publicize school activities, while those with some hours but fewer than 12 were more likely to say the reason was to report both good and bad things about the school.

See Table 26.

The difference in response of advisers based upon college hours on the question of whether stories and editorials have been more fair and accurate both were statistically significant. For stories, chi square was 22.62 (df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .18).

See Table 27.

For editorials, chi square was 31.60 (df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21).

See Table 28.

Advisers with no hours in journalism were the most likely to have no opinion on both questions. After those with no opinion were eliminated, advisers with some hours but fewer than 12 were most likely to say both stories and editorials were more fair. Those with no hours and those with more than 12 hours were about equally likely to say stories and editorials were more fair.

A statistically significant difference was found between advisers based upon hours of journalism credit on the question of whether they had kept more stories from publication during the past 12 months than in a typical 12 months before the Hazelwood decision (chi square = 11.27, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .13). The fewer hours in journalism, the less likely advisers were to say they did not know whether more stories had been kept from publication. When those who did not know were eliminated, there was no significant difference between advisers based upon hours in journalism. The percent of advisers who said they could tell no change in the number of stories they had kept from publication ranged from 95 percent to 96.9 percent.

See Table 29.

Another statistically significant difference was found based upon whether the newspaper had run a story on teen sexuality during the past 12 months (chi square = 12.48, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .19). The more hours in journalism the adviser had, the more likely the newspaper was to have run a story on teen sexuality.

See Table 30.

Whether the newspaper had run a story on divorce and one-parent homes during that time also was statistically significant based upon hours in journalism the adviser had taken (chi square = 13.81, df = 2,significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .20). The more journalism hours, the more likely the newspaper was to have run such a story.

See Table 31.

State Certification. The null subhypothesis was not rejected. Whether an adviser was certified by his/her state to teach journalism was statistically significant for only two questions. There was a statistically significant difference as to the type of story causing the greatest conflict (chi square = 10.31, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .18). State-certified advisers were somewhat more likely to state that the cause of the conflict was that the story was not fair or balanced and that it contained a potential libel, while those not certified were more likely to say it was because of a privacy invasion or an attack on a teacher or because of dirty language or obscenity.

See Table 32.

Based upon state certification of advisers, there was a difference as to whether the newspaper had run a story on teen sexuality in the past 12 months (chi square = 5.49 with Yates Correction and 6.00 without Yates Correction, both significant at .05 level of confidence, V [phi] = .13). Newspapers with state-certified advisers were more likely to have run such a story or editorial.

See Table 33.

Years of Experience. The null subhypothesis was not rejected. There was a statistically significant difference for only 10 of the 21 questions. A significant difference was found between advisers on the question of whether stories and editorials had been more fair and balanced since the Hazelwood decision based

upon the number of years of experience the adviser had teaching journalism or advising the newspaper. For stories, chi square was 26.98 (df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence,
V = = 19).

See Table 34.

For editorials, chi square was 32.16, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21). A large part of the variance was due to high percentage of advisers with less than six years of experience who had no opinion.

See Table 35.

When those with no opinion were eliminated, the more experience the less likely the adviser was to say that stories were more fair (ranging from 12.8 percent to 6.5 percent) and the less likely for the adviser to say editorials were more fair (ranging from 14.3 percent to 10 percent). There also was a statistically significant difference between advisers based upon whether they discussed potentially controversial stories, editorials or photos with the principal (chi
square = 9.96, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .12). Those with less than five years of experience were more likely than the other advisors

---

See Table 36.

---

to do it as a precaution, while those with 6-10 years of experience were most likely to say it was because they were told to do so, and those with more than 10 years of experience were more likely to say they did not discuss contents with the principal.

Based upon years of experience, advisers differed as to whether they ever changed the wording over the objection of the editor (chi square = 7.26, df = 2, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .14). Advisers with more than 10 years of experience were least likely to say they had changed the wording of a story or editorial, and those with 6-10 years of experience were most likely to have done so.

See Table 37.

Based upon how many years of experience the adviser had teaching journalism or advising, a statistically significant difference was found as to whether the adviser had kept more stories from publication than in a typical 12-month period before the Hazelwood ruling (chi square = 42.36, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .25).

Advisers with less than six years experience were much more likely to state that they did not know whether that was the case. After advisers who did not know were eliminated, there was no significant difference between advisers based upon experience. The percent who said there was no change ranged from 94.3 to 97.0 percent.

See Table 38.

A statistically significant difference was found as to whether advisers had run an editorial or news story on drug abuse, teen-age sexuality, AIDS, alcohol abuse, and divorce. For each topic area, advisers with less than six years of experience were least likely to have run a story during the past 12 months.

For use of drug abuse stories, chi square was 8.18 (df = 2, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .15) Advisers with 6-10 years of experience were most likely to have run such a story.

See Table 39.

For teen sexuality stories, chi square was 15.51 (df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .22). There was no significant difference between the response of advisers with 6-10 years experience and those with more than 10 years (64.0 percent versus 64.8 percent).

See Table 40.

For stories on AIDS, chi square was 13.65 (df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .20). Advisers with more than 10 years of experience were more likely than those with 6-10 years of experience to have run a story on AIDS (55.2 percent versus 50.0 percent).

See Table 41.

For alcohol abuse stories, chi square was 22.59 (df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .25). Advisers with 6-10 years of experience were somewhat more likely than those with more than 10 years of experience to have run a story about alcohol abuse during the previous 12 months (84.4 percent versus 81.9 percent).

See Table 42.

For stories on divorce and one-parent homes, chi square was 7.23 (df = 2, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .14). Advisers with 6-10 years of experience were slightly more likely to have run such a story (27.8 percent versus 25.7 percent) than those with more than 10 years of experience.

See Table 43.

Region of the Country. The null subhypothesis was not rejected. Differences to responses to only three of the questions were statistically significant. Because of the high number of cells with expected frequencies less than five, the original seven regions were merged into four for analysis: Northeast, South, Central States, and West. Kristof also used four regions (East, South, Central, and West), though he

does not say what states comprised his regions. [The percent of surveys returned by region was fairly close to that gained by Kristof, ranging from a 0.6 percentage point difference in the percent of respondents from the Central region to a 6.9 percentage point difference in the East.]

There was a significant difference based upon region as to what the adviser saw as the purpose of the newspaper (chi square = 27.70, df = 12, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .16). Advisers in the Northeast were more likely than advisers in other regions to state the purpose was to report both good and bad and as a means for student expression, while those in the South were more likely to state that the reason was to promote positive things about the school and those in the West were most likely to state that the reason was to learn skills.

See Table 44.

Advisers in the four regions also were significantly different in their response to what the school policy was concerning what subject matter could go into the newspaper (chi square = 21.67, df = 9, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .14). Advisers in the West were more likely that those in other regions to say that the newspaper was an open forum except for content that was libelous or obscene or advocated violence (and thus not constitutionally protected speech), while those in the South were more likely to respond that some subject matter is not to go into the paper (even it was constitutionally protected speech). Advisers in the Northeast were more likely than other advisers not to have a policy on content.

See Table 45.

The regions also differed as to the type of story content that was most likely to cause conflict between the adviser and the editor or a writer (chi square = 23.90, df = 2, significant at .05 of confidence, V = .16). Advisers in the South were more likely to state that the type of story was one with a potential libel or one that invaded privacy, while advisers in the Central region were more likely to state the type of story was one that attacked a teacher. Advisers in the West were more likely to say it was because a story was not fair or balanced or that it contained "dirty words."

See Table 46.

Comparing Questions and Categories. The Cramer's V correlations for all 36 questions were averaged to obtain an average correlation for each of the seven independent variables. The variables were city size, school enrollment, existence of a journalism class, the number of college hours in journalism the adviser has taken, whether the adviser is certified by the state to teach journalism, the numbers of years of experience the adviser has, and region of the country where the school is located.

The number of years of experience the adviser had teaching or advising had the highest average V correlation (.141), which indicated that responses by advisers differed the most for that variable. Differences between advisers' responses to 10 of the 21 content and policy questions were statistically significant when controlling for experience. School enrollment ranked second with an average correlation of .136. The difference in responses to 10 of the 21 questions analyzed also was statistically significant controlling for enrollment.

City size ranked third with a .121 average correlation, and responses to eight questions were statistically significant based upon city size. College hours in journalism ranked fourth with a .113 correlation and had six statistically significant responses. Whether journalism courses were offered ranked fifth with a .111 average correlation and had seven statistically significant responses. Region ranked sixth with a .109 average correlation and had three statistically significant responses. Whether the adviser had state certification ranked seventh with a .081 average correlation and had two statistically significant responses.

See Table 47.

The 36 questions also were arranged into eight categories: purpose of the newspaper (Question 16), newspaper policy (Question 17), change in story content since Hazelwood (Questions 18-20), policy for prior review of content (Questions 21-23), extent of censorship (Questions 24-29), change in censorship since Hazelwood (Question 30), major cause of conflict (Question 31), and newspaper content following Hazelwood (Questions 32-36). When the Cramer's V correlations for responses for each independent variable were averaged for each category of questions, the correlation for responses based upon years of experience and whether journalism courses were offered tied for the high with an average correlation of .151, indicating that

responses by advisers varied the most for those two variables. Enrollment ranked third with an average correlation of .131. City size and the number of college hours in journalism the adviser had taken tied for fourth with an average correlation of .125, while region of the country was close behind with an average correlation of .123. Whether the adviser was certified to teach journalism resulted the least difference between advisers. Its average correlation was .100.

The variable of whether journalism classes existed had the highest average correlation for four categories of questions: purpose of the newspaper, type of policy, changes in story content since Hazelwood, and cause of most conflict. Years of experience led or tied for the highest mean correlation for three categories: policy for reviewing content, censorship, and changes in censorship since Hazelwood. Enrollment led or tied for the highest average correlation for two categories: censorship and changes in content since Hazelwood. City size, the number of college hours the adviser had taken in journalism, region of the country, and whether the adviser was certified did not have the highest mean correlation for any category of question.

See Table 48.

Advisers varied the most in responses to questions from the category based upon purpose of the newspaper when controlling for two independent variables--whether a journalism class was offered (.27) and college hours in journalism the adviser had taken (.20)--and the average V correlation for the purpose category was the highest for any category (.173). The variance in responses when controlling for four of the seven independent variables was statistically significant.

Advisers varied the most in their responses for questions in the conflict category when controlling for two independent variables--city size (.21) and whether the adviser was certified (.18). The average V correlation for conflict was slightly less than that for purpose (.166), and differences in responses for five of the seven independent variables was significant. Responses by advisers for questions in the conflict and purpose categories tied for high V correlation when controlling for region of the country (.16).

The average V correlation for the content category ranked third (.131), and responses to questions in an average of 3.6 of the seven categories were statistically significant. Advisers' responses varied the most for questions about content when controlling for school enrollment (.21). Advisers'responses ranked fourth for the average V correlation for questions in the policy category (.130), and responses to questions in an average of 2.0 of the seven independent variables were statistically significant.

Advisers ranked fifth for variance in the category for the amount of change in stories since Hazelwood (with an average variance of .124), and an average of 2.7 of the seven variables were statistically significant. Advisers ranked sixth in the category for the amount of change in censorship since Hazelwood (.121) with an average of 2.0 statistically significant independent variables. Advisers varied the most for the category of change in censorship when controlling for years of experience the advisers had teaching or advising (.25).

Responses by advisers based upon the category of newspaper review ranked seventh (.093) and an average of 1.5 of the seven variables had statistically significant responses. Advisers were most alike in their responses to questions in the conflict category, which had an average correlation of .091 and an average of 1.2 independent variables with statistically significant responses.

See Table 49.

A ninth category of overall change since Hazelwood was devised based upon questions taken from the category of story changes since Hazelwood and the category of change in censorship (questions 18, 19, 20, 22, and 30). Years of experience ranked first with an mean correlation of .160, and whether journalism courses were offered ranked second with a mean correlation of .154. College hours in journalism the adviser had taken ranked third with a mean correlation of .128, region fourth (.104), enrollment fifth (.102), city size sixth (.090), and state certification seventh (.080). An average of 1.8 of the seven independent variables were statistically significant, and the category's average correlation was .083, which was lower than any of the other categories.

See Table 50.

Discussion

The results of the study indicated that the Hazelwood decision did not appear to result in more censorship at high school newspapers. None of the null hypotheses was rejected. Concerning the first category of questions (purpose of the publication), only a minority of advisers thought that the main purpose of the student newspaper was as a teaching tool. Being a means of student expression, publicizing and reporting activities, and promoting positive things about the school were seen as more important by a nearly two-thirds of advisers

For the second category of questions (policy concerning subject matter), the policy at most schools represented was that the newspaper was an open forum for constitutionally protected speech despite the Supreme Court's ruling that student newspaper do not have the constitutional protection that newspapers outside the educational setting would have.

For the third category of questions (story changes), it appears that the Hazelwood decision has resulted in few changes in the content of student newspapers. Most advisers said stories and editorials have not been more fair and balanced since the Hazelwood ruling and that student journalists have not been any less likely to write about potentially controversial subjects.

For the fourth category of questions (policy for prior review) it appears that the Hazelwood decision did not result in a major change in newspaper review policies. A majority of advisers said they discuss controversial content with principals in advance of publication only as a precaution and not because of school policy or the principal's request, and a majority said that they have not been more likely to discuss controversial content with the principal since the Hazelwood decision. Most advisers also said they still don't submit the entire newspaper to the principal for review before publication.

Concerning the fifth category of questions (extent of censorship) most advisers said they had not changed the wording of an editorial of news story in the previous 12 months. In addition, most had not kept a story from publication over the editor's objections for any of the reasons proposed--either because it was poorly written or researched or not fair or balanced, because its subject matter was too controversial, because of possible legal problems, because it might embarrass a student or invade his/her privacy, or because it was an attack on a teacher. Most advisers also said there had not been a change in censorship--that they had not kept more stories from publication during the previous 12 months as in a typical 12-month period before the Hazelwood ruling. Concerning the category of conflict, stories that were not fair or well-balanced were the greatest cause of conflict with editors and writers. Concerning the sixth category (changes in censorship since the Hazelwood ruling), most advisers said they had seen no change in the number of stories kept from publication in the previous 12 months.

Concerning the seventh category (cause of most conflict), most advisers said that stories that were not fair or well-balanced caused the most conflict with the editor or a writer.

Concerning the eighth category (types of potentially controversial content run), the types of potential controversial stories that student newspaper had run varied considerably, with most newspapers having run stories on drug abuse and alcohol abuse and on teen-age sexuality, but not about AIDS or divorce and one-parent homes.

Three independent variables that indicated the most variance between advisers were years of experience, enrollment, and whether a journalism course was offered. Years of experience ranked first or tied for first as the variable with the greatest variance for all three measures: comparison of the overall number of survey questions, comparison by category, and comparison of amount change since Hazelwood. Whether journalism courses were offered tied for first for categories of questions and was second for change measure. Two other independent variances ranked among the top three for variance.

Enrollment ranked second for the comparison of responses to all questions and third for comparison based upon categories, and city size ranked third for the measure based upon all questions. At the other end of the scale, state certification ranked seventh on all three measures and, thus, was the variable with the least variance between advisers.

Though years of experience showed the most variance between advisers, much of that rating comes from the fact that teachers with less than six years of experience were more likely to have no opinion than did those with more experience. When "no opinion" or "I don't know" responses were eliminated from the three questions for which they were allowed, differences between advisers were no longer statistically significant. Also when those "no opinion" responses were eliminated, the variable of whether journalism courses were offered ranked first both on the measure based upon responses by categories and on the measure based upon questions indicating extent of change since Hazelwood--the two measures that are most useful.

Conclusions

The study suggests that the Hazelwood decision has not had the predicted outcome of increasing censorship, and it suggests that advisers are not too different based upon several of the independent variables used in the survey. The categories in which responses by advisers were most different were whether journalism courses were offered at the school and years of experience the adviser had teaching journalism or advising. Advisers were somewhat more alike in their responses based upon the school's enrollment, and they were much more alike based upon the number of college hours in journalism they had taken, city size, and region of the

country. They were most alike in their responses based upon whether they were state certified. Advisers varied most in their responses based on what they see as the purpose of the newspaper, what causes the most conflict with editors and writers, what they see as objectionable content, and their policy about newspaper content. They varied least concerning what they said about changes that have occurred in the newspaper since the Hazelwood decision, on their policy of prior review, and on the extent of censorship practiced.

Admittedly, the survey reflects advisers' perceptions of current reality and their impressions of past situations. A survey of principals or students might reveal a different image of the status of freedom of the high school press in the post-Hazelwood era. Whatever its limitations, the study does suggest, however, that the *Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier* decision might not be the disaster many people in journalism education feared. Much of that may be due to the importance that many advisers put on freedom of the press and to a laissez-faire policy by principals. The study does indicate that student press freedom can exist co-exist with the Hazelwood ruling. Even though it is a marriage not made in heaven but in the Supreme Court, it may be workable until an annulment can be obtained.

References

Abrams, M., and Goodman, S. M. (1988, July) End of an Era? The decline of student press rights in the wake of the Kuhlmeier decision. Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication national convention, Portland, OR.

Brown, J. E. (1988, September) The Relativity of Freedom. Support for the Learning and Teaching of English Newsletter, pp. 1-2.

Campbell, L. (1971, February/March). The role of the high school newspaper. Quill & Scroll, p. 22.

Click, J. W., and Kopenhaver, L. L. (1990). Opinions of principals toward student press freedom and advisers' responsibilities following Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier. Paper presented at the national convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Minneapolis, MN.

Dickson, T. V. (1989a). Advisers report no increase in censorship. Unpublished manuscript.

Dickson, T. V. (1989b). Attitudes of high school principals about press freedom after Hazelwood. Journalism Quarterly, 66, 169-173.

Dickson, T. V. (1989c, August) How advisers view the status of high school press freedom following the Hazelwood decision. Paper presented at the national convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, DC.

Dickson, T. V. (1989d). [Principals report no change in publication review]. Unpublished raw data.

Eveslage, T. (1988, February/March). Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier: A Threat and a Challenge to High School Journalism. Quill & Scroll, pp. 9-10.

Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier, 108 S.Ct. 562 (1988).

Horine, D. R. (1966). How principals, advisers and editors view the high school newspaper. Journalism Quarterly, 66, 339-345.

Kristof, N. D. (1983). Freedom of the high school press. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

McNabb, S. (1988, September) Censoring Student Newspapers Hurts Education. Support for the Learning and Teaching of English Newsletter, p. 2.

Nelson Commission of Inquiry into High School Journalism. (1974). Captive voices. New York: Schocken Books.

Supreme Court and students' rights--an update. (1988, February). Phi Delta Kappa International Newsletter, p. 1.

Trager, R., and Dickerson, D. L. (1980). Prior restraint in high school: Law, attitudes and practice. Journalism Quarterly, 57, 135-138.

Table 1

Adviser's Opinion of the Most Important Purpose of Newspaper Controlling for Size of City

		Less Than 10,000	10,000-50,000	More than 50,000
To promote positive things about school	N	18	4	4
	Col. %	(10.3%)	(3.8%)	(5.5%)
To report both good and bad things	N	20	21	12
	Col. %	(11.5%)	(20.2%)	(16.4%)
To publicize school events/ activities	N	18	6	3
	Col. %	(10.3%)	(5.8%)	(4.1%)
A means for student expression	N	45	41	24
	Col. %	(25.9%)	(39.4%)	(32.9%)
For students to learn skills	N	73	32	30
	Col. %	(42.0%)	(30.8%)	(41.1%)
Total	N	174	104	73
	Row %	(49.6%)	(29.6%)	(20.8%)

Note. Chi square = 17.03, df = 8, significant at .05 level of significance, V = .16.

Table 2

Fairness of Editorials in Newspaper Since Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Size of City

		Less Than 10,000	10,000-50,000	More than 50,000
More fair	N	14	11	5
	Col. %	(8.0%)	(10.3%)	(6.7%)
No more fair	N	88	58	53
	Col. %	(50.3%)	(54.2%)	(70.7%)
No opinion	N	73	38	17
	Col. %	(41.7%)	(35.5%)	(22.7%)
Total	N	175	107	75
	Row %	49.0	30.0	21.0

Note. Chi square = 10.05, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence; V = .12)

Table 3

Whether Adviser Has Rejected an Article Over the Editor's Objections Because of Legal Concerns Controlling for Size of City

		Less Than 10,000	10,000-50,000	More than 50,000
No	N	163	102	65
	Col. %	(94.2%)	(95.3%)	(85.5%)
Yes	N	50	18	16
	Col. %	(5.8%)	(4.7%)	(14.5%)
Total	N	173	107	76
	Row %	(48.6%)	(30.1%)	(21.3%)

Note. Chi square = 7.11, df = 2, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .14.

Table 4

Whether Adviser Has Rejected an Article Over the Editor's Objections for Privacy Concerns Controlling for Size of City

		Less Than 10,000	10,000-50,000	More than 50,000
No	N	122	91	61
	Col. %	(70.5%)	(85.0%)	(80.3%)
Yes	N	51	16	15
	Col. %	(29.5%)	(15.0%)	(19.7%)
Total	N	173	107	76
	Row %	(48.6%)	(30.1%)	(21.3%)

Note. Chi square = 8.46, df = 2, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .15.

Table 5

Type of Newspaper Contents That Have Caused the Most Conflict Controlling for Size of City

		Less Than 10,000	10,000-50,000	More than 50,000
Potential Libel	N	19	10	6
	Col. %	(11.7%)	(10.6%)	(9.2%)
Privacy Invasion	N	45	12	5
	Col. %	(27.8%)	(12.8%)	(7.7%)
Not Fair/ Balanced	N	70	58	50
	Col. %	(43.2%)	(61.7%)	(76.9%)
Attack on Teacher	N	17	6	1
	Col. %	(10.5%)	(6.4%)	(1.5%)
Dirty Language	N	11	8	3
	Col. %	(6.8%)	(8.5%)	(4.6%)
Total	N	162	94	65
	Row %	(50.5%)	(29.3%)	(20.2%)

Note. Chi square = 29.40, df = 8, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21.

Table 6

Whether Newspaper Has Run a Story on Teen Sexuality in Past 12 Months Controlling for Size of City

		Less Than 10,000	10,000-50,000	More than 50,000
Yes	N	74	61	57
	Col %	(43.0%)	(58.1%)	(76.0%)
No	N	98	44	18
	Col %	(57.0%)	(41.9%)	(24.0%)
Total	N	172	105	75
	Row %	(48.9%)	(29.8%)	(21.3%)

Note. Chi square = 23.67, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .26.

Table 7

Whether Newspaper Has Run a Story on AIDS in Past 12 Months Controlling for Size of City

		Less Than 10,000	10,000-50,000	More than 50,000
Yes	N	59	57	39
	Col %	(34.3%)	(53.8%)	(52.0%)
No	N	113	49	36
	Col %	(65.7%)	(46.2%)	(48.0%)
Total	N	172	106	75
	Row %	(48.7%)	(30.0%)	(21.2%)

Note. Chi square = 12.62, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .19.

Table 8

Whether Newspaper Has Run a Story on Divorce in Past 12 Months Controlling for Size of City

		Less Than 10,000	10,000-50,000	More than 50,000
Yes	N	22	29	25
	Col %	(13.0%)	(27.4%)	(33.3%)
No	N	147	77	50
	Col %	(87.0%)	(72.6%)	(66.7%)
Total	N	169	106	75
	Row %	(48.3%)	(30.3%)	(21.4%)

Note. Chi square = 15.46, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21.

Table 9

Fairness of Stories in Newspaper Since Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
More fair	N	10	7	5
	Col. %	(6.5%)	(6.3%)	(5.3%)
No more fair	N	73	58	66
	Col. %	(47.7%)	(52.3%)	(69.5%)
No opinion	N	70	46	24
	Col. %	(45.8%)	(41.4%)	(25.3%)
Total	N	153	111	95
	Col. %	(42.6%)	(30.9%)	(26.5%)

Note: Chi square = 11.98, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .13.

Table 10

Whether Adviser Submits Newspaper for Principal's Review Controlling for School's Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
Does not submit	N	117	94	89
	Col. %	(77.5%)	(84.7%)	(92.7%)
Did so before and has continued	N	19	8	6
	Col. %	(12.6%)	(7.2%)	(6.3%)
Began doing so after Hazelwood	N	15	9	1
	Col. %	(9.9%)	(8.1%)	(1.0%)
Total	N	151	111	96
	Row %	(42.2%)	(31.0%)	(26.8%)

Note: Chi square = 11.83, df = 4, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .13.

Table 11

Whether Adviser Has Rejected an Article Over the Editor's Objections for Privacy Concerns Controlling for School's Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
No	N	102	92	81
	Col. %	(67.1%)	(83.6%)	(83.5%)
Yes	N	50	18	16
	Col. %	(32.9%)	(16.4%)	(16.5%)
Total	N	152	110	97
	Row %	(42.3%)	(30.6%)	(27.0%)

Note. Chi square = 11.24, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .18.

Table 12

Whether Adviser Has Rejected an Article Over the Editor's Objections Because It Attacked a Teacher Controlling for Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
No	N	115	97	88
	Col. %	(75.7%)	(88.2%)	(90.7%)
Yes	N	37	13	9
	Col. %	(24.3%)	(11.8%)	(9.3%)
Total	N	152	110	97
	Row %	(42.3%)	(30.6%)	(27.0%)

Note. Chi square = 12.24, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .18.

Table 13

Type of Story Causing Greatest Conflict with Editor or Writer Controlling for Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
Potential Libel	N	18	10	7
	Col. %	(12.8%)	(10.2%)	(8.2%)
Privacy Invasion	N	34	18	12
	Col. %	(24.1%)	(18.4%)	(14.1%)
Not Fair or Balanced	N	62	54	61
	Col. %	(44.0%)	(55.1%)	(71.8%)
Attack on a Teacher	N	15	7	2
	Col. %	(10.6%)	(7.1%)	(2.4%)
Contained Dirty Language	N	12	9	3
	Col. %	(8.5%)	(9.2%)	(3.5%)
Total	N	141	98	85
	Row %	(43.5%)	(30.2%)	(26.2%)

Note. Chi square = 18.68, df = 8, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .17.

47

Table 14

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Drug Abuse in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
Yes	N	100	73	79
	Col. %	(66.2%)	(66.4%)	(83.2%)
No	N	51	37	16
	Col. %	(33.8%)	(33.6%)	(16.8%)
Total	N	151	110	95
	Row %	(42.4%)	(30.9%)	(26.7%)

Note. Chi square = 9.59, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .16.

Table 15

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Teen-Age Sexuality in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
Yes	N	60	60	74
	Col. %	(39.7%)	(54.5%)	(78.7%)
No	N	91	50	20
	Col. %	(60.3%)	(45.5%)	(21.3%)
Total	N	151	110	94
	Row %	(42.5%)	(31.0%)	(26.5%)

Note. Chi square = 35.53, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .32.

Table 16

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on AIDS in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
Yes	N	51	49	58
	Col. %	(33.8%)	(44.5%)	(61.1%)
No	N	100	61	37
	Col. %	(66.2%)	(55.5%)	(38.9%)
Total	N	151	110	95
	Row %	(42.4%)	(30.9%)	(26.7%)

Note. Chi square = 17.58, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .22.

Table 17

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Alcohol Abuse in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
Yes	N	103	76	80
	Col. %	(68.2%)	(69.1%)	(84.2%)
No	N	48	34	15
	Col. %	(31.8%)	(30.9%)	(15.8%)
Total	N	151	110	95
	Row %	(42.4%)	(30.9%)	(26.7%)

Note. Chi square = 8.61, df = 2, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .16.

Table 18

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Divorce and Broken Homes in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Enrollment Grades 10-12

		Under 500	500-1,000	Over 1,000
Yes	N	20	24	31
	Col. %	(13.5%)	(21.8%)	(32.6%)
No	N	128	86	64
	Col. %	(86.5%)	(78.2%)	(67.4%)
Total	N	148	110	95
	Row %	(41.9%)	(31.2%)	(26.9%)

Note. Chi square = 12.67, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .19.

Table 19

Adviser's Opinion of the Most Important Purpose of Newspaper Controlling for Whether Journalism Classes Are Offered

		Classes Offered	No Classes Offered
To promote positive things about school	N	17	9
	Col. %	(6.3%)	(10.6%)
To report both good and bad things	N	35	18
	Col. %	(12.9%)	(21.2%)
To publicize school events/activities	N	14	13
	Col. %	(5.2%)	(15.3%)
A means for student expression	N	83	30
	Col. %	(30.6%)	(35.3%)
For students to learn skills	N	122	15
	Col. %	(45.0%)	(17.6%)
Total	N	271	85
	Row %	(76.1)	(23.9)

Note. Chi square = 26.41, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .27.

Table 20

Type of Policy School Has Concerning Content of School Newspaper Controlling for Whether Journalism Classes Are Offered

		Classes Offered	No Classes Offered
Open forum for all forms of student expression	N	4	2
	Col. %	(1.5%)	(2.4%)
Open forum unless libelous, obscene or advocates violence	N	187	46
	Col. %	(68.0%)	(54.1%)
Some subject matter not allowed even if not libelous, etc.	N	66	19
	Col. %	(24.0%)	(22.4%)
No policy on content exists	N	18	18
	Col. %	(6.5%)	(21.2%)
Total	N	275	85
	Row %	(76.4%)	(23.6%)

Note. Chi square = 16.22, df = 3, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21.

Table 21

Fairness of Stories in Newspaper Since Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Whether Journalism Classes Are Offered

		Classes Offered	No Classes Offered
More fair	N	21	1
	Col. %	(7.6%)	(1.2%)
No more fair	N	163	35
	Col. %	(59.3%)	(40.7%)
No opinion	N	91	50
	Col. %	(33.1%)	(58.1%)
Total	N	275	86
	Row %	76.2	23.8

Note. Chi square = 19.15, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence; V = .23)

Table 22

Fairness of Editorials in Newspaper Since Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Whether Journalism Classes Are Offered

		Classes Offered	No Classes Offered
More fair	N	26	5
	Col. %	(9.4%)	(5.8%)
No more fair	N	168	34
	Col. %	(60.9%)	(39.5%)
No opinion	N	82	47
	Col. %	(29.7%)	(54.7%)
Total	N	276	86
	Row %	76.2	23.8

Note. Chi square = 17.79, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence; V = .22.

Table 23

Type of Newspaper Contents That Have Caused the Most Conflict Controlling for Whether Journalism Classes Are Offered

		Classes offered	No classes offered
Potential libel	N	30	5
	Col. %	(11.9%)	(6.8%)
Privacy invasion	N	41	23
	Col. %	(16.2%)	(31.5%)
Not fair/balanced	N	150	29
	Col. %	(59.3%)	(39.7%)
Attack on teacher	N	18	6
	Col. %	(7.1%)	(8.2%)
Dirty language	N	14	10
	Col. %	(5.5%)	(13.7%)
Total	N	253	73
	Row %	(77.6%)	(22.4%)

Note. Chi square = 17.25, df = 4, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .23.

Table 24

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Drug Abuse in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Whether Journalism Classes Are Offered

		Classes offered	No classes offered
Yes	N	202	52
	Col. %	(74.0%)	(61.2%)
No	N	71	33
	Col. %	(26.0%)	(38.8%)
Total	N	273	85
	Row %	(76.3%)	(23.7%)

Note. Chi square = 4.56 with Yates Correction, 5.17 without Yates Correction, df = 1, significant at .05 level of confidence, V (phi) = .12.

Table 25

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Teen-Age Sex in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Whether Journalism Classes Are Offered

		Classes Offered	No Classes Offered
Yes	N	158	36
	Col. %	(57.9%)	(42.9%)
No	N	115	48
	Col. %	(42.1%)	(57.1%)
Total	N	273	84
	Row %	(76.5%)	(23.5%)

Note. Chi square = 5.25 with Yates Correction, 5.84 without Yates Correction, df = 1, significant at .05 level of confidence, V (phi) = .13.

Table 26

Adviser's Opinion of the Most Important Purpose of Newspaper Controlling for Number of College Hours in Journalism

		No hours	Fewer than 12	12-18 hours
To promote positive things about school	N	17	4	5
	Col. %	(13.2%)	(4.4%)	(3.6%)
To report both good and bad things	N	17	16	20
	Col. %	(13.2%)	(17.8%)	(14.6%)
To publicize school events/ activities	N	16	6	5
	Col. %	(12.4%)	(6.7%)	(3.6%)
A means for student expression	N	46	27	40
	Col. %	(35.7%)	(30.0%)	(29.2%)
For students to learn skills	N	33	37	67
	Col. %	(25.6%)	(41.1%)	(48.9%)
Total	N	129	90	137
	Row %	(36.2%)	(25.3%)	(38.5%)

Note. Chi square = 27.82, df = 8, significant at .001 level of significance, V = .20.

Table 27

Fairness of Stories in Newspaper Since Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Adviser's College Hours in Journalism

		No hours	Fewer than 12	12-18 hours
More fair	N	5	9	8
	Col. %	(3.8%)	(10.0%)	(5.7%)
No more fair	N	55	54	90
	Col. %	(42.0%)	(60.0%)	(64.3%)
No opinion	N	71	27	42
	Col. %	(54.2%)	(30.0%)	(30.0%)
Total	N	131	90	140
	Row %	(36.3%)	(24.9%)	(38.8%)

Note. Chi square = 22.62, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence; V = .18.

Table 28

Fairness of Editorials in Newspaper Since Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Adviser's College Hours in Journalism

		No hours	Fewer than 12	12-18 hours
More fair	N	7	11	13
	Col. %	(5.3%)	(12.1%)	(9.3%)
No more fair	N	53	57	92
	Col. %	(40.5%)	(62.6%)	(65.7%)
No opinion	N	71	23	35
	Col. %	(54.2%)	(25.3%)	(25.0%)
Total	N	131	91	140
	Row %	(36.2%)	(25.1%)	(38.7%)

Note. Chi square = 31.60, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence; V = .21.

Table 29

Whether Adviser Has Kept More Stories from Publication Than in a Typical 12-Month Period Before the Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for College Hours in Journalism

		No hours	Fewer than 12	12-18 hours
No change	N	95	76	120
	Col. %	(77.2%)	(83.5%)	(88.9%)
More stories kept from publication	N	3	4	6
	Col. %	(2.4%)	(4.4%)	(4.4%)
Not known	N	25	11	9
	Col. %	(20.3%)	(12.1%)	(6.7%)
Total	N	123	91	135
	Col. %	(35.2%)	(26.1%)	(38.7%)

Note. Chi square = 11.27, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .13.

Table 30

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Teen-Age Sexuality in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Adviser's College Hours in Journalism

		No hours	Fewer than 12	12-18 hours
Yes	N	54	56	85
	Col. %	(42.2%)	(60.9%)	(62.0%)
No	N	74	36	52
	Col. %	(57.8%)	(39.1%)	(38.0%)
Total	N	128	92	137
	Col. %	(35.9%)	(25.8%)	(38.4%)

Note. Chi square = 12.48, df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .19.

Table 31

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Divorce and Broken Homes in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Adviser's College Hours in Journalism

		No hours	Fewer than 12	12-18 hours
Yes	N	16	17	42
	Col. %	(12.5%)	(18.7%)	(30.9%)
No	N	112	74	94
	Col. %	(87.5%)	(81.3%)	(69.1%)
Total	N	128	91	136
	Col. %	(36.1%)	(25.6%)	(38.3%)

Note. Chi square = 13.81, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .20.

Table 32

Type of Newspaper Contents That Have Caused the Most Conflict Controlling for Whether Adviser is State Certified to Teach Journalism

		State Certified	Not Certified
Potential Libel	N	26	9
	Col. %	(14.9%)	(6.0%)
Privacy Invasion	N	30	34
	Col. %	(17.1%)	(22.8%)
Not Fair/ Balanced	N	99	78
	Col. %	(56.6%)	(52.3%)
Attack on Teacher	N	10	14
	Col. %	(5.7%)	(9.4%)
Dirty Language	N	10	14
	Col. %	(5.7%)	(9.4%)
Total	N	175	149
	Row %	(54.0%)	(46.0%)

Note. Chi square = 10.31, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .18.

Table 33

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Teen-Age Sexuality in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Whether Adviser is State Certified to Teach Journalism

		State Certified	Not Certified
Yes	N	115	80
	Col. %	(61.2%)	(48.2%)
No	N	73	86
	Col. %	(38.8%)	(51.8%)
Total	N	188	166
	Row %	(53.1%)	(46.9%)

Note. Chi square = 5.49, 6.00 with Yates Correction, df = 1, significant at .02 level of confidence, V (phi) = .13.

Table 34

Fairness of Stories in Newspaper Since Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising Newspaper

		Under 6 Years	6-10 Years	Over 10 Years
More fair	N	10	7	5
	Col. %	(6.0%)	(7.9%)	(4.7%)
No more fair	N	68	58	72
	Col. %	(41.0%)	(65.2%)	(67.9%)
No opinion	N	88	24	29
	Col. %	(53.0%)	(27.0%)	(27.4%)
Total	N	166	89	106
	Row %	(46.0%)	(24.7%)	(29.4%)

Note. Chi square = 26.98, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .19.

Table 35

Fairness of Editorials in Newspaper Since Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising Newspaper

		Under 6 Years	6-10 Years	Over 10 Years
More fair	N	14	9	8
	Col. %	(8.4%)	(10.1%)	(7.5%)
No more fair	N	68	62	72
	Col. %	(41.0%)	(69.7%)	(67.3%)
No opinion	N	84	18	27
	Col. %	(50.6%)	(20.2%)	(25.2%)
Total	N	166	89	107
	Row %	(45.9%)	(24.6%)	(29.6%)

Note. Chi square = 32.16, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .21.

Table 36

Reasons Advisers Discuss Newspaper Contents with Principal Before Publication Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising

		Under 6 Years	6-10 Years	Over 10 Years
Does not discuss with principal	N	33	25	39
	Col. %	(20.1%)	(28.1%)	(36.4)
Principal asked or school policy	N	26	16	12
	Col. %	(15.9%)	(18.0%)	(11.2%)
As a precaution	N	105	48	56
	Col. %	(64.0%)	(53.9%)	(52.3%)
Total	N	164	89	107
	Row %	(45.6%)	(24.7%)	(29.7%)

Note. Chi square = 9.96, df = 4, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .12.

Table 37

Whether Adviser Has Changed Wording Over Objections of Editor in Previous 12 Months Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising

		Under 6 Years	6-10 Years	Over 10 Years
Never	N	105	51	80
	Col. %	(64.4%)	(56.7%)	(74.8%)
One or more times	N	58	39	27
	Col. %	(35.6%)	(43.3%)	(25.2%)
Total	N	163	90	107
	Row %	(45.3%)	(25.0%)	(29.7%)

Note. Chi square = 7.26, df = 2, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .14.

Table 38

Whether Adviser Has Kept More Stories from Publication Than in a Typical 12-Month Period Before the Hazelwood Ruling Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising

		Under 6 years	6-10 years	Over 10 years
No change	N	110	83	98
	Col. %	(71.0%)	(92.2%)	(94.2%)
More stories kept from publication	N	5	5	3
	Col. %	(3.2%)	(5.6%)	(2.9%)
Not known	N	40	2	3
	Col. %	(25.8%)	(2.2%)	(2.9%)
Total	N	155	90	104
	Col. %	(44.4%)	(25.8%)	(29.8%)

Note. Chi square = 42.36, df = 4, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .25.

Table 39

Whether Newspaper Has Run an Editorial or News Story on Drug Abuse in the Past 12 Months Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising

		Under 6 years	6-10 years	Over 10 years
Yes	N	104	72	78
	Col. %	(63.8%)	(80.0%)	(74.3%)
No	N	59	18	27
	Col. %	(36.2%)	(20.0%)	(25.7%)
Total	N	163	90	105
	Row %	(45.5%)	(25.1%)	(29.3%)

Note. Chi square = 8.18, df = 2, significant at .02 level of confidence, V = .15.

Table 40

Whether Newspaper Has Run a Story on Teen Sexuality in Past 12 Months Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising

		Under 6 years	6-10 years	Over 10 years
Yes	N	70	57	68
	Col %	(42.9%)	(64.0%)	(64.8%)
No	N	93	32	37
	Col %	(57.1%)	(36.0%)	(35.2%)
Total	N	163	89	105
	Row %	(45.7%)	(24.9%)	(29.4%)

Note. Chi square = 15.51, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .22.

Table 41

Whether Newspaper Has Run a Story on AIDS in Past 12 Months Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising

		Under 6 years	6-10 years	Over 10 years
Yes	N	55	45	58
	Col %	(33.7%)	(50.0%)	(55.2%)
No	N	108	45	47
	Col %	(66.3%)	(50.0%)	(44.8%)
Total	N	163	90	105
	Row %	(45.5%)	(25.1%)	(29.3%)

Note. Chi square = 13.65 df = 2, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .20.

Table 42

Whether Newspaper Has Run a Story on Alcohol Abuse in Past 12 Months Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising

		Under 6 years	6-10 years	Over 10 years
Yes	N	99	76	86
	Col %	(60.7%)	(84.4%)	(81.9%)
No	N	64	14	19
	Col %	(39.3%)	(15.6%)	(18.1%)
Total	N	163	90	105
	Row %	(45.5%)	(25.1%)	(29.3%)

Note. Chi square = 22.59, df = 2, significant at .001 level of confidence, V = .25.

Table 43

Whether Newspaper Has Run a Story on Divorce in Past 12 Months Controlling for Years of Experience Adviser Has Teaching Journalism or Advising

		Under 6 years	6-10 years	Over 10 years
Yes	N	24	25	27
	Col %	(15.0%)	(27.8%)	(25.7%)
No	N	136	65	78
	Col %	(85.0%)	(72.2%)	(74.3%)
Total	N	160	90	105
	Row %	(45.1%)	(25.4%)	(29.6%)

Note. Chi square = 7.23, df = 2, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .14.

Table 44

Adviser's Opinion of the Most Important Purpose of Newspaper Controlling for Region

		N.E.	South	Central	West
To promote positive things about school	N	2	11	9	3
	Col. %	(3.6%)	(12.0%)	(7.6%)	(3.4%)
To report both good and bad things	N	13	7	22	11
	Col. %	(23.2%)	(7.6%)	(18.6%)	(12.6%)
To publicize school events/ activities	N	4	9	9	5
	Col. %	(7.1%)	(9.8%)	(7.6%)	(5.7%)
A means for student expression	N	27	26	32	28
	Col. %	(48.2%)	(28.3%)	(27.1%)	(32.2%)
For students to learn skills	N	10	39	46	40
	Col. %	(17.9%)	(42.4%)	(39.0%)	(46.0%)
Total	N	56	92	118	87
	Row %	(15.9%)	(26.1%)	(33.4%)	(24.6%)

Note. Chi square = 27.70, df = 12, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .16. Northeast = Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut; South = Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi,

Table 44 (Continued)

Adviser's Opinion of the Most Important Purpose of Newspaper Controlling for Region

---

Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas; Central = Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas; West = Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Utah, California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii.

Table 45

Type of Policy School Has Concerning Content of School Newspaper Controlling for Region

		N.E.	South	Central	West
Open forum for all student expression	N	2	2	0	2
	Col. %	(3.5%)	(2.2%)	(0.0%)	(2.2%)
Open forum if not libelous, obscene, etc.	N	36	45	84	67
	Col. %	(63.2%)	(49.5%)	(70.0%)	(75.3%)
Some subject matter not allowed	N	10	32	26	15
	Col. %	(17.5%)	(35.2%)	(21.7%)	(16.9%)
No policy on content	N	9	12	10	5
	Col. %	(15.8%)	(13.2%)	(8.3%)	(5.6%)
Total	N	57	91	120	89
	Row %	(16.0%)	(25.5%)	(33.6%)	(24.9%)

Note. Chi square = 21.67, df = 9, significant at .01 level of confidence, V = .14. N.E. = Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut; South = Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, N. Carolina, S. Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas; Central = Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, N. Dakota, S. Dakota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas; West =

Table 45 (Continued)

Type of Policy School Has Concerning Content of School Newspaper Controlling for Region

---

Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Utah, California, Oregon, Wash., Alaska, and Hawaii.

Table 46

Type of Newspaper Contents That Have Caused the Most Conflict Controlling for Region

		N.E.	South	Central	West
Potential Libel	N	5	11	13	5
	Col. %	(9.6%)	(14.3%)	(11.5%)	(6.2%)
Privacy Invasion	N	8	20	24	11
	Col. %	(15.4%)	(26.0%)	(21.2%)	(13.6%)
Not Fair/ Balanced	N	32	42	51	53
	Col. %	(61.5%)	(54.5%)	(45.1%)	(65.4%)
Attack on Teacher	N	4	2	15	3
	Col. %	(7.7%)	(2.6%)	(13.3%)	(3.7%)
Dirty Language	N	3	2	10	9
	Col. %	(5.8%)	(2.6%)	(8.8%)	(11.1%)
Total	N	52	77	113	81
	Row %	(16.1%)	(23.8%)	(35.0%)	(25.1%)

Note. Chi square = 23.90, df = 12, significant at .05 level of confidence, V = .16. Northeast = Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut; South = Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi,

Table 46 (Continued)

Type of Newspaper Contents That Have Caused the Most Conflict Controlling for Region

---

Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas; Central = Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas; West = Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Iadho, Nevada, Montana, Utah, California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii.

Table 47

Cramer's V Correlations for Independent Variables

	Q2 City size	Q3 Enroll-ment	Q5 Journ. course	Q7 College hours	Q8 State cert.	Q10 Years exper.	Region
Q16	.16*	.14	.27***	.20***	.14	.14	.16**
Q17	.13	.10	.21***	.12	.08	.13	.14**
Q18	.09	.13*	.23***	.18***	.05	.19***	.12
Q19	.12*	.11	.22***	.20***	.12	.21***	.10
Q20	.10	.08	.09	.05	.03	.09	.10
Q21	.07	.11	.05	.04	.01	.12*	.10
Q22	.10	.09	.13	.08	.07	.06	.10
Q23	.10	.13*	.05	.07	.07	.09	.12
Q24	.11	.02	.04	.10	.02	.14*	.11
Q25	.05	.04	.10	.09	.13	.07	.10
Q26	.07	.11	.10	.07	.08	.10	.11
Q27	.14*	.12	.03	.07	.10	.12	.08
Q28	.15*	.18**	.03	.08	.09	.13	.09
Q29	.06	.18*	.05	.05	.06	.09	.08
Q30	.04	.10	.10	.13*	.13	.25***	.10
Q31	.21***	.17*	.23**	.13	.18*	.08	.16*
Q32	.09	.16**	.12*	.12	.03	.15*	.11
Q33	.26***	.32***	.13*	.19**	.13*	.22***	.09
Q34	.19**	.22***	.04	.09	.10	.20**	.12
Q35	.10	.16*	.04	.11	.01	.25***	.08
Q36	.21***	.19**	.08	.20***	.09	.14*	.12

Table 47 (Continued)

Cramer's V Correlations for Independent Variables

	Q2 City size	Q3 Enroll-ment	Q5 Journ. course	Q7 College hours	Q8 State cert.	Q10 Years exper.	Region
Av.	.121	.136	.111	.113	.081	.141	.109

Note. Underlined correlation indicates high for that row.

* significant at .05-.02 level of confidence

** significant at .01 level of confidence

*** significant at .001 level of confidence

Table 48

Mean Cramer's V Correlations for Content Categories

	Categories							
	PUR	POL	SCH	REV	CEN	CCH	CON	CNT
Q2	.16	.13	.10	.09	.10	.04	.21	.17
Q3	.14	.10	.11	.11	.11*	.10	.17	.21*
Q5	.27*	.21*	.18*	.08	.06	.10	.23*	.08
Q7	.20	.12	.14	.06	.08	.13	.13	.14
Q8	.14	.08	.07	.05	.08	.13	.18	.07
Q10	.14	.13	.16	.15*	.11*	.25*	.08	.19
Rgn	.16	.14	.11	.11	.10	.10	.16	.10
Av.	.173	.130	.124	.093	.091	.121	.166	.131

Note. Underlining indicates high for the row.

* = high for the column

PUR = purpose of newspaper

POL = policy toward newspaper

SCH = changes in story content since Hazelwood

REV = extent of review

CEN = extent of censorship

CCH = extent of change in censorship since Hazelwood

CON = reason for greatest conflict with editor

CNT = extent of change in content

Table 48 (Continued)

Mean Cramer's V Correlations for Content Categories

Q2 = city size

Q3 = school enrollment

Q5 = whether journalism class is offered

Q7 = hours of college journalism taken by adviser

Q8 = whether adviser is state certified

Q10 = amount of experience adviser has teaching/advising

Rgn = region

Table 49

Comparison of Content Categories for Number of Statistically Significant Responses by Independent Variable and for Average Cramer's V Correlation

	Average No. of Significant Responses	Average Cramer's V Correlation
Purpose of newspaper	4.0	.173
Cause of conflict	5.0	.166
Type of content	3.6	.131
Type of policy	2.0	.130
Amount of story change	2.7	.124
Change in censorship	2.0	.121
Extent of prior review	1.5	.093
Amount of censorship	1.2	.091

Table 50

V Scores for Category Composed of Amount of Change in Content and in Prior Review and Censorship Since Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier Decision by Independent Variable

	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q22	Q30	Aver.
Yrs. of Exper.	.19***	.21***	.09	.06	.25***	.160
Class offered	.23***	.22***	.09	.13	.10	.154
College credits	.18***	.20***	.05	.08	.13*	.128
Region	.12	.10	.10	.10	.10	.104
Enrollment	.13	.11	.08	.09	.10	.102
City size	.09	.12*	.10	.10	.04	.090
Certified	.05	.12	.03	.07	.13	.080

* = significant at .05 level of confidence

*** = significant at .001 level of confidence

AEJMC SECONDARY EDUCATION DIVISION
HIGH SCHOOL NEWSPAPER ADVISERS SURVEY

This survey should be completed by the school newspaper adviser if there is one. If there is no newspaper adviser, a journalism teacher or the head of the English Department should complete only Part I. Please mark only one response per question on the answer sheet using a No. 2 pencil and return the answer sheet in the enclosed stamped envelope. The only thing you need to do on the left side of the answer sheet is to put the postal abbreviation for your state in boxes K-L under special codes.

PART I. Preliminary Information

1. Which of the following best describes you?
   (a) newspaper adviser
   (b) journalism teacher but not newspaper adviser
   (c) English teacher but not adviser or journalism teacher
2. Which of the following best describes your school's location?
   (a) rural area or community with less than 10,000 population
   (b) city or suburb with a population of 10,000 to 50,000
   (c) city with a population of 50,000 to 150,000
   (d) city with a population of 150,000 to 500,000
   (e) city of more than 500,000 population
3. How many students are enrolled in grades 10-12 at your school?
   (a) under 200
   (b) 200-500
   (c) 500-1,000
   (d) 1,000-1,500
   (e) more than 1,500
4. What is the approximate percent of racial minorities at your school?
   (a) under 10 percent
   (b) 10-30 percent
   (c) 30-50 percent
   (d) 50-70 percent
   (e) more than 70 percent
5. Does your school offer journalism courses?
   (a) yes
   (b) no
6. Is there a student newspaper at your school?
   (a) yes
   (b) no
7. How many college hours do you have in journalism?
   (a) none
   (b) some, but fewer than 12 hours
   (c) 12-18 hours
   (d) more than 18 hours
8. Are you certified in your state to teach journalism?
   (a) yes
   (b) no

9. Is journalism certification mandatory in your state for a permanent journalism teaching certificate?
   (a) yes
   (b) no
   (c) I don't know
10. How many years of experience have you had teaching journalism or advising the newspaper at the high school level?
   (a) I don't teach it.
   (b) 1 to 5 years at the end of this school year
   (c) 6 to 10 years at the end of this school year
   (d) 11 to 15 years at the end of this school year
   (e) more than 15 years at the end of this school year
11. Are you a member of the Journalism Education Association?
   (a) yes
   (b) no
12. If journalism certification were offered by the Journalism Education Association, how important to you would it be to gain such certification?
   (a) very important
   (b) fairly important
   (c) not of much importance
   (d) not important at all
   (e) no opinion

PART II. Information about the Newspaper

If you are the adviser to the student newspaper, please answer the following questions as well as those in PART I.

13. How frequently is the student newspaper published?
   (a) more than once a month
   (b) approximately once a month
   (c) more than 4 times a year, but less often than monthly
   (d) 4 times a year or less
   (e) No student newspaper is published.
14. Do students on the newspaper staff earn academic credit?
   (a) Yes, students get English credit.
   (b) Yes, students get journalism credit.
   (c) No credit is given.
15. Which of the following best describes what is required for a student to be on the newspaper staff?
   (a) Journalism courses are not offered at the school, and anyone in the appropriate grade(s) can be on the staff.
   (b) A journalism course or courses are offered, but it is not required that newspaper staff members have taken one.
   (c) Staff members must have finished at least one journalism course, but they do not have to be taking a course.
   (d) Staff members must have finished at least one journalism course and have to be currently taking a course.
   (e) Staff members do not have to have finished a beginning journalism course, but they must be enrolled in it.

16. Which of the following do you see as the most important purpose of the student newspaper?
(a) a means for promoting positive things about the school
(b) a means for reporting both good and bad things about the school
(c) a means for publicizing school events/activities
(d) a means for student expression
(e) a means for journalism students to learn skills

17. Which of the following best explains the type of policy the school has concerning what subject matter should and should not go into your student newspaper?
(a) It is an open forum for all forms of student expression.
(b) It is an open forum for forms of student expression that are not libelous, obscene or advocate violence.
(c) Some subject matter is not to go into the paper, even if the story is not libelous, obscene or advocating violence.
(d) There is no policy about what is acceptable subject matter for stories.

18. Do you think that since the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier, which allowed school administrators to determine content of school plays and publications, stories by student journalists have covered all sides of issues better than before the decision?
(a) Stories have been much more fair and balanced.
(b) Stories have been somewhat more fair and balanced.
(c) I can't tell much difference in fairness and balance.
(d) Stories have been less fair and balanced.
(e) No opinion or no way to tell

19. Since the Hazelwood ruling, have student journalists been any more likely to write editorials that covered all sides of an issue than before the ruling?
(a) Editorials have been much more fair and balanced.
(b) Editorials have been somewhat more fair and balanced.
(c) There is no difference in their fairness and balance.
(d) Editorials have been less fair and balanced.
(e) No opinion or no way to tell

20. Since the Hazelwood ruling, have student journalists been any less likely to write about potentially controversial subjects?
(a) much less likely to write about such subjects
(b) somewhat less likely to write about such subjects
(c) about as likely to write about such subjects
(d) somewhat more likely to write about such subjects
(e) much more likely to write about such subjects.

21. If you occasionally discuss potentially controversial stories, editorial or photos with the principal before publication, for which of the following reasons do you ordinarily do so?
(a) I don't discuss such content with him/her.
(b) I discuss such content with the principal because he/she has asked me to do so or because it is a school policy.
(c) The principal hasn't asked me to do so, but I discuss such content with him/her as a precaution in case problems arise with a story/editorial/photo.

22. If you discuss potentially controversial stories or photos with the principal more often than before the Hazelwood decision, what is the reason you do so?
(a) I don't discuss such material with him/her more often.
(b) I do so because the principal seems more interested.
(c) I do so because the principal has told me to do so.
(d) I do so because of a change in school policy.

23. If you submit the entire newspaper to the principal for his/her review before publication, how long have you done so?
(a) I don't submit the newspaper for review.
(b) I did so before the Hazelwood ruling and have continued.
(c) I did not do so before the ruling, but I have done so since then because I know the principal is interested.
(d) I did not do so before the ruling, but I have done so since then because of school or the principal's policy.
(e) I did not do so before the ruling, but I have done so since then in case something in it is controversial.

24. In the past 12 months, about how many times have you changed the wording in an editorial or news story over the objections of the editor?
(a) never
(b) 5 times or fewer
(c) 6 to 10 times
(d) 11 to 20 times
(e) more than 20 times

25. In the past 12 months, about how many times has a story been kept from publication over the editor's objections because it is poorly written or researched or not fair or balanced?
(a) never
(b) once
(c) 2-5 times
(d) 6-10 times
(e) more than 10 times

26. In the past 12 months, about how many times has a story been kept from publication over the editor's objections because its subject matter was too controversial?
(a) never
(b) once
(c) 2-5 times
(d) 6-10 times
(e) more than 10 times

27. In the past 12 months, how many times has a story been kept from publication over the editor's objections because of possible legal problems?
(a) never
(b) once
(c) 2-5 times
(d) 6-10 times
(e) more than 10 times

28. In the past 12 months, how many times has a story been kept from publication over the editor's objections because it might embarrass a student or invade his/her privacy?
(a) never
(b) once
(c) 2-5 times
(d) 6-10 times
(e) more than 10 times

29. In the past 12 months, how many times has a story been kept from publication over the editor's objections because it was an attack against a teacher?
(a) never
(b) once
(c) 2-5 times
(d) 6-10 times
(e) more than 10 times

30. Do you think you have kept more stories from publication during the last 12 months than you did in a typical 12-month period before the Hazelwood ruling?
(a) I have seen no change in the number of such stories.
(b) More stories have been kept from publication.
(c) Fewer stories have been kept from publication.
(d) I don't know.

31. What type of stories have caused the largest amount of conflict between you and the editor or a writer?
(a) stories that contained potential libel
(b) stories that invaded privacy or embarrassed students
(c) stories that were not fair or well-balanced
(d) stories that attacked a teacher
(e) stories that had obscenities or dirty language

32. In the past 12 months, has the newspaper run an editorial or news story on the issues involved in drug abuse?
(a) yes
(b) no

33. In the past 12 months, has the newspaper run an editorial or news story on issues concerning teen-age sexuality?
(a) yes
(b) no

34. In the past 12 months, has the newspaper run an editorial or news story on issues concerning AIDS?
(a) yes
(b) no

35. In the past 12 months, has the newspaper run an editorial or news story on issues concerning alcohol abuse?
(a) yes
(b) no

36. In the past 12 months, has the newspaper run an editorial or news story on the issues involved in divorce and broken homes?
(a) yes
(b) no

Please put additional comments on another sheet of paper and put with the answer sheet. If you do not favor national journalism certification by JEA, please note why you feel that way.

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP.